

Application No. 10/710,287
Response to Office Action mailed May 4, 2006
Attorney Docket No. 03-0348

REMARKS

The Examiner has required restriction to one of the following groups of claims:

- I. Claims 1-8 and 35-38;
- II. Claims 9-30;
- III. Claims 31-34;
- IV. Claims 39 and 40.

Applicants hereby elect to prosecute the claims of Group I. The claims of Groups II – IV are hereby withdrawn without prejudice.

The Examiner has further required that Applicants elect, within the Group I claims, either Species A (claim 1) or Species B (claim 35), and if Species A is elected, to further elect a sub-species from claim 6.¹

Applicants hereby elect species A and the sub-species “IP address” from claim 6 with traverse. Applicants submit that claim 1 is generic to all sub-species recited in claim 6, and traverse on the ground that “an allowable generic claim may link a reasonable number of species embraced thereby.” (MPEP § 806.04).

Respectfully submitted,

May 30, 2006

Date



Marisa J. Kaplan
Reg. No. 58,368

¹ The Office Action states that the sub-species should be selected from claim 5. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner intended to write claim 6, as there is no “IP address” recited in claim 5.

Application No. 10/710,287
Response to Office Action mailed May 4, 2006
Attorney Docket No. 03-0348

Joshua S. Broitman
Reg. No. 38,006
Ostrager Chong Flaherty and
Broitman P.C.
250 Park Avenue, Suite 825
New York, New York 10177-0899
Tel. No.: (212) 681-0600
Customer No. 44702